FBIS-SOV-85-225
Thursday
21 November 1985
Vol III No 225 Supp 013

Supplement

Daily Report

SOVIET UNION

REAGAN - GORBACHEV

SUMMIT

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FBIS **DAILY REPORT**

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 225 *21 Nov 85*

GORBACHEV HOLDS NEWS CONFERENCE AFTER TALKS

REPORTAGE ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT MEETING

Reagan, Gorbachev at Joint Ceremony 21 Nov 1
Gorbachev Remarks 1
Reagan Remarks 1
Further Summit Planned *[AFP]* 2
Joint Statement 2
Further Reportage on 20 Nov Proceedings 4
'Difficulties' in Conversations *[Zorin, Kalyagin]* 4
Gorbachev, Reagan Attend Reception 4
Talks Conclude 4
Gorbachev Remarks to Newsmen 5
Further on Gorbachev Remarks 5
U.S. Endorses Description *[Seyful-Mulyukov]* 6
Gorbachev, Soviet Delegation Depart Geneva 6
Further Report *[AFP]* 6
Reagan Departs Geneva for Brussels 21 Nov 6
Pessimism at Talks Termed 'Inappropriate' *[Seyful-Mulyukov]* 6
Coverage of Summit by U.S. Newsmen Critiqued *[Orlov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 7
Talks, Events, New Coverage in Geneva Reviewed *[Ivanov, Kondrashov, Kuznetsov in IZVESTIYA 21 Nov]* 8
Washington 'Hawks' Nervous About Results of Talks 10
Soviet Envoy in Nicaragua Previews Summit Topics *[Managua Radio Sandino]* 10
World Figures', Organizations' Hopes for Summit 11
UN's Perez de Cuellar 11
Italy's Andreotti 12
Arab League Statement 12
U.S., Soviet Writers 12
Medical Workers *[Repin in TRUD 20 Nov]* 12
Gorbachev Sends Messages en Route to Geneva 13

Gorbachev Holds News Conference After Talks

LD211226 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1000 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Press conference given by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at the press center of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations in Geneva — live]

[Text] Esteemed ladies, gentlemen, comrades: Our talks with the President of the United States of America, the first in the last 6 and a 1/2 years, have just ended. This is, without doubt, a significant event in international life. The significance of this meeting will be even clearer if one bears in mind not only Soviet-U.S., but international relations as a whole, which are going through a particularly — as I would allow myself to put it — difficult period.

First, a few words about what preceded the Geneva meeting. It was awaited with impatience throughout the world. People had great hopes for it, for the improvement of the situation in the world, and for a lowering of the dangerous level of international tension which has reached a dangerous level. True, doubts were also expressed: Has the confrontation of two powers not gone too far to be able to count on any accords at all? All this was the case — you know this as well as we do.

As far as we, the Soviet Union, are concerned, we too had a good, realistic concept of the situation and had not the slightest illusions about U.S. policy. We saw how far the militarization of the economy and even of the political thinking in that country had progressed. But we well understood that the situation in the world is too dangerous to disregard even the slightest opportunity to improve the situation, to advance toward a more stable and firm peace.

Even several months before the conference and on the eve of the meeting itself, we started, as it were, to pave the way to the Geneva meeting and to create a favorable climate for it. In the summer we halted all nuclear explosions unilaterally, having expressed the readiness to immediately resume talks on a complete halt to nuclear tests. We also confirmed a unilateral moratorium on tests of antisatellite weapons, and as you know, we put forward radical proposals for the reduction of nuclear arsenals. Our proposals — to prevent the arms race being carried into to space — have been accompanied by proposals on the development of the broadest international cooperation in the peaceful research and use of space for the benefit of all peoples. I repeat: We have been doing everything possible, even before the meeting, to lay foundations for mutual understanding and to improve the political atmosphere.

Just before the Geneva summit meeting, a session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries was held in Sofia, at which the powerful voice of the socialist countries sounded out in defense of peace, for a relaxation of tension and cooperation, against the arms race and confrontation, and in favor of an improvement in the international situation in the interests of all peoples on earth.

Although these steps of ours, dictated by a feeling of responsibility for the fate of peace, did not meet with a proper reaction on the part of our partners in the forthcoming talks in Geneva, we held firmly to a constructive position. We considered it essential to endeavor through strength of arguments, strength of example, and strength of common sense to break the dangerous course of events.

The very complexity of the international situation convinced us that a direct conversation with the President of the United States was essential because of the enormous role which both the Soviet Union and the United States play. Naturally, an enormous responsibility also arises out of this role for these states and their political leaders. Our conclusion was as follows. The time had come when, under the threat of universal nuclear death, one must learn the great art of living together. Both of our peoples — the Soviet and, I am deeply convinced, the U.S. — are equally interested in this. All the peoples of the world are interested in this.

We felt and continue to feel that the mood of the peoples in all countries is in favor of peace, and that the desire to not only preserve peace, but also improve the situation and gain real progress in the fight to halt the arms race is increasing. This is a situation which has a great twofold significance and contains two great meanings and conclusions.

On the one hand, it was inspiring. It means that what we are doing is in keeping with the hopes and aspirations of the vast masses of people in the world, regardless of where they live and to which political views, religious convictions, or traditions they subscribe. But at the same time, it was not only inspiring, but it also committed us to a great deal — primarily, to responsibility.

Perhaps if one were to describe, to say in one word, what it is that characterizes the present state of development of the international situation, it would be: Enormous responsibility. The peoples have understood this responsibility and they act in ways which befit them. But it follows that this situation and this characterization ought to nourish states' policies and also the practical actions of politicians.

One cannot make up for the absence of a policy that takes adequate account of the pressing needs being felt by all the peoples of the world with all kinds of propagandist packaging. The people have now learned to understand everything rapidly and to put everything in its place. This is my deep conviction, and this has helped me and my colleagues in the Soviet Union who make up the country's political leadership, to, by understanding the situation in this way, secure ourselves against unnecessary wrong steps and concentrate our attention on a constructive path, on the quest for ways toward a better world, a more peaceful world.

I was enormously impressed by the letters I received — from the Soviet Union, from the United States of America, from Australia, from the whole of Europe, from Asia and Africa — from children, women, men, veterans.

It is very important to stress that the youth of the whole planet raised their voice very actively in these letters: Those to whom the future belongs, who are stepping forward into life and taking responsibility for the fate of the world onto their shoulders.

Now, to the meeting itself. The face-to-face conversations with President Reagan took up quite a large proportion of it. And, not just arithmetically. The meetings were frank, prolonged, sometimes sharp — at individual moments extremely sharp — and yet, it seems to me, to a certain extent also productive. They took up, of course, significantly more time than planned; I would say they took up the main part of the time during these 2 days.

When the President and I took our leave of each other just now, we counted how many times we had met alone and we settled on somewhere around five or six times. As a rule, these conversations lasted an hour or more. They allowed us, you understand, to discuss a broad range of problems face to face. The conversations, in political language, were frank, direct, and I think they had not only a great, but I would say decisive significance.

Above all, precisely at these conversations, as well as at the plenary meetings and in the extensive contacts between all members of the delegations on the corresponding levels of experts — both on the Soviet and the U.S. side this part was represented by quite authoritative people known not only in our country, but throughout the world. All this taken together made it possible in these 2 days to do serious work, serious work.

We presented our views to the President and also our assessment of the situation in the world. The starting point of our analysis is this: In the past decades, cardinal changes have taken place in the world and they need a new approach, a fresh view on many things concerning foreigh policy.

One very important feature is characteristic for the present international situation; we recognize it as such and we and the United States have to take it into account in our foreign policies. I am referring to the following: Under the present conditions, the issue is not only the confrontation between two social systems, but the choice between survival and mutual destruction. In other words, the questions of war and peace. Questions of survival are, by the very course, the objective course of the world process. I would like to underline that I am especially using the word "survival" not to dramatize and frighten, but in order for us all to feel, to feel deeply, and to recognize the realities of today's world. These questions have now emerged in the foreground and are — this problem is immediate and urgent, and affecting the interests of us all — alive. I would say they have moved to the center of world politics. We cannot go away from the search for solutions to this urgent problem. Such is, we are convinced, the will of the Soviet people, the will of the U.S. people — such is the will of all peoples. This, first of all.

Secondly, we have once more drawn the attention of the U.S. side to the following circumstance: I have already talked about it, but this is such an important circumstance and we attach such a great importance to it that we decided to express it again at this meeting; namely, the fact that even at present it is very difficult to start productive dialogue and talks on questions of halting the arms race and nuclear disarmament. Tomorrow, it will be even more difficult.

This is why the meeting was necessary, why responsible dialogue was necessary. We have reached the point — all of us — where we must stop, look around, think again, and decide, on the basis of realities, on the basis of a broad approach to the determination of national interests, what we must do next in the world.

During the meetings and conversations I wanted to understand what position on this cardinal issue — the issue of war and peace — was being adopted by the present U.S. Administration. Well, we have all read quite a lot on this matter and many of you have said a great deal overall on this subject. But, for those who make the decisions it is particularly important to understand what the very point of departure is for how our partners are formulating their policies; what are the initial ideas behind the foreign policy of the present U.S. Administration. [long pause]

It took a great deal of work — great efforts, I would even say — to try without prejudice and with great responsibility, with a broad view, to evaluate everything which would help find an answer to this very important question.

Here is what I would like to talk about now: This analysis has shown that notwithstanding the diversity of approaches and evaluations which came to the surface during this very serious and necessary work — without which, without doing this work it would have been impossible to come to the meeting — we discovered, so it seems to us, that we have something in common which could serve as a starting point in improving our relations. This is an understanding of the fact that nuclear war is inadmissible, that it cannot be waged and it cannot have any victors. This thought was expressed more than once, both on our side and the U.S. side. And from this it follows that the central problem in relations between our countries in the present stage is the problem of security. We are resolutely in favor of attaining agreements ensuring equal security for both our sides. We imagine that it is precisely on this basis that it will be possible to effect consistent strengthening of mutual trust and a general improvement in the political atmosphere, within which one can hope for the development of political dialogue, for fruitful discussion of economic problems, humanitarian problems, problems of contacts, reciprocal information, and so forth.

Here also is the key to the problem of preservation of life on earth and the problem of the change of atmosphere toward good will.

We told the President that we have not been striving and will not be striving to achieve superiority over the United States in the sphere of security. Furthermore, I tried more than once in private and at plenary sessions of the delegations, to express our deep conviction that less security for the United States of America, if compared with the Soviet Union, would be disadvantageous for us because it would lead to distrust and lack of faith, and would generate instability. But we, at the same time, reckon on the same approach by the U.S. side concerning us. We told the President and all members of the delegation that we in turn, would not allow the United States to achieve superiority over us under any circumstances. I think this is a logical argument. Both sides would have to become used to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations. If there is anything to talk about, it is how, by joint efforts, to reduce the level of this parity. In other words, to implement realistic measures for the reduction of nuclear arms on a common basis. Here is a sphere worthy of leaders of such great states as the Soviet Union and the United

States of America, and also a sphere of action for other states' leaders, because this is our common question.

From this, the following conclusion of fundamental importance also follows quite logically: Neither of us, neither the United States of America nor the Soviet Union, must do anything that opens doors for an arms race in space or in new spheres — specifically in space. This is why, if this is done, then the scale of military rivarly [pauses, restarts] If this were to be done — if the doors were opened to space — then the scale of this rivalry would grow immeasurably, and the arms race, I think, would assume — it can even now be forecast to a certain extent — an irreversible character, because it is very difficult to keep controls on it.

It is very difficult to verify it. And each side would have the feeling at any moment that it is losing out in something and it would feverishly search for ever new methods of responding. This would urge on the arms race, and not only in space, but on earth too, for the responses do not necessarily have to be in that sphere. They simply have to be effective This is my reasoning, and I am reasoning before you in the same way as when I was conversing with the President. One can imagine that if such a situation were to begin, the possibility of an agreement on some restraint of this military rivalry, the arms race, would become, in general, very, very problematical. I should like to return again to my assertion that the present period is characterized by the fact that we have reached a certain point. And if one fails to consider and weigh everything in a truly responsible fashion, one could reach such political conclusions and, as a result of incorrect, erroneous conclusions for politicians.... [appears to correct himself] for politics, one could embark on such steps as will have grave consequences for our peoples.

The differences between our countries will remain. The rivalry between us will also be maintained. But we must act in such a fashion that this rivalry does not go beyond the framework of what is permitted and does not lead to a military confrontation. Let each of the social systems prove its advantages by example. We have a good idea of not only the weak aspects, but also the strong aspects of U.S. society and of that of other developed countries. We know their achievements and their potential. Of course, we know better our own possibilities, including the unrealized ones. In brief, we are in favor of competition with the United States of America, in favor of active competition. History itself is not simply theoretical estimations and reasoning. History itself has convincingly confirmed the vitality of the policy of peaceful coexistence. [Gorbachev at this point takes a drink of water] I am trying to have less water ["water" here means "padding" or "waffling"] in my speech but, nonetheless, water is necessary. [laughter from auditorium]

Further, a great deal in the development of our mutual relations depends on how each of the sides interprets the world around us. It seems to us that it is particularly important here to have a precise understanding of historical realities and to take account of them when forming one's policies. In this instance I have in mind both the Soviet leadership and the U.S. leadership. The world today is a very multifaceted totality of sovereign countries, peoples who have their own interests, their own aspirations, their own policies, their own traditions, and their own dreams. Many of them have only just embarked upon the path of independent development. Their first steps are taking place in incredibly difficult conditions which have been left by colonialism, by dependence. Some of them, having achieved political independence, wish to ensure for themselves economic independence. They see that they have resources, they have a work force.

The first steps are being taken in unbelieveably [neveroyatno] difficult conditions left by colonialism and dependence. Some of them, having achieved political independence, want to ensure economic independence for themselves. They see that they have resources, they have manpower, and they have a combination of that which, in the corresponding labor process, so to speak, can provide them with a better life. They are, after all, enormous continents. It is a natural desire of every people to put its sovereign rights into practice both in the political sphere and in the economic and social ones. This policy pleases some and not others, but it is a reflection of the internal processes of each country in question, of the interests of this or that people which indeed has the sovereign right, the right to choose, choice of road, choice of system, methods, forms, and even choice of friends. This is the right of every people. If this is not acknowledged I do not know how international relations can be built.

When I went to England in December last year and I managed to acquaint myself — although I recalled the expression from back when I studied international relations at the law faculty of Moscow University — I knew those words, but I decided to restore them: They are the words of the famous Palmerston, where it was said that England does not have eternal friends or eternal enemies, there are only personal [pauses] eternal interests. Well, perhaps I am not speaking literally, but close. At that time I said to Mrs Thatcher, I agree with that, but if Palmerston and you, the present political leader of England, recognize that you have such interests, then you must recognize that other peoples and other countries also have their interests, and when about 200 states enter the international arena, each of them is striving to realize its own interests. But to what extent they are put into practice depends on taking account of the interests of others. That means there will be something in common, based on cooperation. To calculate in such a way that the whole world is someone's fiefdom; and here I refer both to the Soviet Union, to the United States, and to other countries: We reject that principle. We have always said this, both 10 years ago and today we are saying it, and we shall say it tomorrow:— It is no good. We do not have a dual policy here. Here we are conducting an honest and open policy, and we act in that way. Tension — we said this both to the President and to the U.S. delegation as a whole — conflicts, even regions [as heard] and even wars which arise in one part or another between various states in one part of the world or another, are rooted both in the past and in today's socioeconomic conditions of those countries and regions.

To represent the matter as if all these tangles of contradictions are caused by the competition between East and West is not only incorrect, it is extremely dangerous. If today Mexico and a number of other states, including rich states, even Brazil, are not only unable to pay their debts, but also unable to even pay the interest on the debts, one can imagine what will happen and what processes are brewing in these societies. The situation will become more acute, it will lead to an explosion, and what then? Will this again be the head of Moscow? Listen, one cannot come

out irresponsibly with such judgements on such questions before the world. These banalities still occur here and there. However, they are impermissible, and particularly at such meetings as ours. Therefore, we at once agreed, let us not talk banalities with each other. Many banalities were used on the eve, during the preparation, and in the course of the preparation for the meeting. It was a squabble, with your assistance. [laughter]

Certainly, the Soviet Union and the United States are two mighty powers, with global interests, with their allies and friends. They have their own priorities in foreign policy. However, the Soviet leadership sees this not as a source of confrontation, but more as a source of enhanced, particular responsibility of our states, the Soviet Union and the United States of America and their leaders, for the fate of the world. That is how we understood it. Certainly, we can argue about the state of affairs in one part of the world or another — particularly that our assessments will be different, often opposite, particularly when it concerns some events or other, the reasons for some conflicts or other.

In principle, we are not against discussion of various regional problems within the framework of seeking ways to facilitate their settlement. We spoke of this and the President and I agreed to continue these joint efforts — this was reflected in the concluding statement — but we constantly stress and I should like to say this now, without any kind of interference in the internal affairs of other states.

Such is our concept of Soviet-U.S. relations with which we came to the meetings and which we set out before the President and the whole delegation. It was presented in just this form — in a much more expanded form of course, but I have tried to summarize the gist of it — at the meeting in Geneva. We consider that an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations is quite possible. Many problems have accumulated — I would say there are whole piles of them to be cleared up — and the Soviet leadership has the political will to do this work, but it must be done jointly. When rockfalls take place and geologists or miners are in a critical situation, the rescue teams work toward each other, in order to solve the problem and save their people.

We must do this rescue work with joint efforts to save our relations from a further increase in tension so that we do not move toward confrontation, but return them to a normal channel, toward improvement. We are ready for this.

I said to the President, it will be a big mistake if you and I do not make use of the chance that has come up to change the situation in our relations — and in view of the tremendous influence of our states, that means in the world, too — for the better.

I would like to return once again to the main issue which was, so to speak, the crux of the meeting. There was not a session, nor a face-to-face meeting, where it did not occupy the central position. I am thinking of the issue of war and peace, arms control. This was the crux of the Geneva meeting.

We explained to the U.S. side that the "star wars" program will not only give an impulse to the arms race in all types of weapons, but will also put an end to all restraint in this race. In reply, they spoke again and again about the supposedly defensive nature of a large-scale system of antimissile defense with space-based elements. They said to us: What will you tell your people after Geneva — that you refused to make reductions in offensive weapons? On this score our answer was this: I repeat, we are ready for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons on the condition that the door be shut firmly on the development of an arms race in space. We are ready to go the first step, on the basis of applying a 50 percent principle of reduction, and then, bringing in other nuclear powers, to go further.

Among the people, to a certain extent in the world perhaps, even among certain politicians and even journalists, there is, so to speak, a certain positive reaction to SDI. They say that after all, we are talking about defensive weapons, about a shield.

That is completely wrong. After all, the main point — taking into consideration the fact that mountains of weapons have already been stockpiled in the world now — is that it is further being proposed to us that since there is an arms race and we cannot get the better of this process or take it in hand, curb it, and go backwards, it is further being proposed to us, in this most complex situation, to open up competition in space. Who will guarantee, who will be able to give a guarantee that we will then be able to organize any kind of productive talks? I think no sensible person will be able to. And then the U.S. side does not want to admit SDI means putting weapons into space. But it does mean weapons in space.

And if today there are weapons on earth and under the water, then we will have waves of Soviet — of U.S. and Soviet weapons — over the heads of all peoples. And we will look, gaze at that sky, and wait for something to crash down. Let us all imagine — this is what we wanted to say to the U.S. side — let us imagine for a moment — given the collisions there have been and are happening now — something separates from a rocket, the head goes on, the carrier part falls away, and it collides with some kind of grouping of these space weapons. Signals will be set off, which may be seen almost as an attempt by the other side — I am not saying by whose side, by ours or whose, in this case — as a signal that an attempt is being undertaken to annihilate this. [as heard] All computers are switched on, the politicians cannot do anything sensible in that case, and we are at the mercy of events.

Yes, one can paint many pictures. I said to the President that in as far as we feel this idea has captured him, as a person, we can perhaps even understand to some extent; but that his position as a politician — answering for such a powerful state, for its defence, for questions of security — this we cannot understand. We think that after these conversations, the U.S. side will weigh all that we said on this theme in the most responsible manner.

We saw at the meeting that the Americans do not like our logic, but we can in no way discover any logic in their arguments. They say: Believe us, if we are the first to invent it, we will share it with you. Then, Mr President, I call on you to believe us. We have already stated that we will not use weapons and we will not attack the United States of America. Why are you beginning — while not just preserving the entire offensive potential on earth and under the water — why are you further proposing, why do you intend to launch an arms race in space? Don't you believe us? It becomes clear that you do not believe us. And why should

we believe you any more than you believe us? We have all the more grounds not to believe you, as we are calling on you not to clamber into space, and to engage in disarmament on earth. That is a thought which every person can understand.

On the whole, one would like to hope — and this is what we believe — that this was not the U.S. side's last word. The talks were thorough: We listened attentively to each other's arguments and recorded all of it. If the United States finds the will and resolve to think again and evaluate all the destructive aspects and consequences of the "star wars" program, a path will open up for a constructive solution to the problems of the international situation and of halting the arms race.

When I speak of this, I bear in mind that this also applies to problems of verification. A large amount of speculation is being built up around this problem, with the USSR's position being deliberately distorted. But the truth boils down to the fact that the Soviet Union is open to verification. If an accord is achieved on banning the transfer of weapons to space, we are prepared on a mutual basis to open our laboratories for monitoring an accord of that kind. What has been suggested to us is something like: Let us open up the laboratories and monitor how the arms race in space is going. That is naivete; the starting point is fallacious and unacceptable. If the U.S. side also halts all nuclear weapons tests and we conclude an agreement on this, again there will be no problems whatsoever from our side regarding verification, including international inspection. If both sides agree to reduce nuclear weapons by 15 percent, then of course the reduction process will have to be monitored; we are interested in that no less than the Americans are.

I would like to say literally two words about the fact that at this stage differences also came to light in the positions regarding a 50-percent reduction in nuclear weapons. We have observations on the plan presented by the Americans; the Americans have observations on our plans. But we are not making a drama out of these differences; we are ready to search for a mutually acceptable solution in the event that a race does not begin in space. The two sides' proposals form a basis for a search for mutually acceptable solutions: Compromises are possible here; time and clarification of the situation are required. We are ready to search for these solutions, proceeding from the founding principle that we are not striving to achieve superiority and we are for equal security.

At the meeting there was an exchange on problems of a humanitarian nature. This resulted in the appropriate agreements reflected in the statement. I will recall that we succeeded in achieving agreement on certain questions of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. Agreement was reached on expanding contacts in the scientific and cultural fields, and in the field of education and information. Exchanges of students, television programs, and sports delegations will be wider. An accord has been reached in principle to conclude an agreement on air communications. I think a report arrived from Moscow...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] Apparently yesterday.

[Gorbachev] Apparently yesterday, and this problem has been removed.

I would especially like to draw your attention to the fact that it was decided to jointly address a number of other states regarding cooperation in the field of thermonuclear fusion.

This is a very interesting idea. Its implementation could open a fresh page in an extraordinarily important sphere — providing mankind with an essentially inexhaustible source of energy. Here you have a field for joint work. And here, incidentally, one needs both enormous efforts on the part of scientists and great efforts on the part of the technical world; technological innovations which would promote and accelerate technical progress and that of technology.

From the point of view of political results and the consequences of the meeting, it seems to me important to take yet another factor into account. We have witnessed the great political effect of the meeting. It revealed and activated the interest of the world public in the problems of Soviet-U.S. relations, the danger of the arms race, and the necessity of normalizing the situation.

I cannot fail to mention, in this connection, several episodes. The day before yesterday, our mission was visited by a group of leaders of U.S. pacifist movements, headed by the prominent politician, Jesse Jackson. I should like to say that we saw and continue to see them as worthy and respected U.S. citizens who represent millions of inhabitants of the United States who signed the address to President Reagan and myself, wishing us success in our meeting, and with specific proposals for strengthening peace, including an appeal to stop nuclear tests.

U.S. war veterans, who took part in the Elbe meeting, also came to Geneva. Representatives of many public organizations of other countries, including children's organizations — I believe Leonid Mitrifanovich here received them at my request; it was a very moving meeting — were also here. Not to mention the fact that we constantly felt the powerful support and solidarity of our socialist friends and the nonaligned countries. Even before the meeting, the leaders of six states, India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece, and Sweden, addressed us with a proposal to freeze all kinds of nuclear arms. We value their initiative highly.

A group — a large group — of Nobel Prize winners put forward a proposal which I was prepared to sign immediately, except for one point. It included the following wish or demand: Not to depart or leave Geneva until we had come to an agreement. [laughter from hall] But it's a bit risky, at the moment, to give one's full agreement to this because one might not ever return to one's homeland. [laughter] Although now I might have thought differently. I would probably have put my signature under this point as well.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, comrades. At sharp turning points, at pivotal stages in history, it happens that moments of truth are simply as vital as air. The international situation has become too dangerous because of the intensified arms race; there are too many fables being concocted on that score, frightening people. A real need has come about to blow away that fog and to verify words with deeds. You won't do better than with the aid of direct talking, such as is offered usually by a summit meeting. I especially have in mind our states, considering their roles and responsibilities in the world. Here the discussion of problems is

translated onto a new plane, where it is no longer possible to hide from the truth. And so, when we speak of the general outcome of the meeting, there will hardly be a correct or some sort of unambiguous evaluation.

Of course, it would have been so much better if we had reached agreement in Geneva on the main, the central problem of stopping the arms race. This, unfortunately, did not happen. The U.S. side so far has not proved ready for major decisions. But on the whole, I think this process could not have been completed in these 2 days, even if it had been held on such a wavelength. We have a mechanism.

But, at the same time, the meeting that took place was too important an event to evaluate in some sort of simplistic categories. It has permitted a clearer understanding of the nature of our disagreements, the removal — at least I think so and hope so — of certain prejudiced evaluations in relation to the USSR and the policy of its leadership, the clearing away of the accumulated, or at least some of the accumulated prejudices. It may have a favorable influence on the further process of the development of events. Trust is not re-established in one go. It is not an easy process.

We listened attentively to the President's assurances that the United States is not striving for superiority and does not want a nuclear war. We sincerely want these statements to be confirmed in deeds. We should like to look at the meeting as the beginning of a dialogue with the aim of gaining changes for the better, for the better both in Soviet-U.S. relations, and indeed in the world as a whole. In that sense I would rate the meeting as creating the possibilities for moving forwards. Such, in general outline, is our evaluation of the results and significance of the Geneva meeting, and this gives me the grounds, as I leave hospitable Geneva, to view the future with optimism. Common sense must triumph. Till we meet again. [applause]

[Unidentified speaker] Please, your question first.

[Unidentified speaker in English] Please identify yourself.

[Question in English with superimposed translation] Mr General Secretary, (Johnson), BBC television news, London. Mr General Secretary, people in the West often ask what the results of this summit meeting will be for the correlation of the forces of the Soviet Union and the United States, East and West.

[Gorbachev] I am looking to the future (?here), and if we begin to act, not just in Soviet-U.S. relations, but also in international relations, in the spirit of responsibility, which I think nevertheless was present at the Geneva meeting, we will find the answers to the most vital problems and ways of resolving them. I am deeply convinced of this.

[Question] Valentin Zorin, Soviet Union. You have spoken of the need for a new approach in international relations today, even for a new way of thinking. How, specifically, do you see this new approach, this new way of thinking?

[Gorbachev] I am convinced that a new policy is needed for the present stage of international relations, which are interlinked and are characterized by a great interlinkage between states, interdependence. We see a new approach as being that the realities of the modern world would underlie the contemporary policy of any state. That is the main precondition for the foreign policy of states to be constructive, and for its implementation to lead to an improvement of the world situation. The problems of peace and war are at the center of all world politics, a particular concern of all peoples. In all countries, in the developed capitalist, in socialist countries, in the developing world, there are economic problems, there are social problems, there are ecological problems. They can be more successfully resolved on the basis of cooperation and mutual understanding. Dialogue is needed, an expansion of cooperation and of trade is needed, a joining of forces is needed. This must be kept in mind. In the end, the problems of the developing world cannot be shut off, shut off from what is building up there.

We must seek in this new policy answers to the questions of these enormous continents answers which correspond with these realities. Here there are hundreds of states which are striving for a better life. And the most important issue — I am returning to it — is that we have to do everything to stop the arms race. This is now understood by all. If this is not done, all our remaining hopes, plans, and actions might be worth nothing. So I am convinced that there will be no progress through the old approaches, which take into account only where policy is exclusively bounded by purely egotistical interests, although they are passed off as national interests. A new policy is needed which corresponds to the present stage, taking into account all realities which have been brought to the fore by the very course of the world process.

[Question in English with superimposed translation] Our states jointly defeated fascism. Do you think that the Soviet Union and the United States can be allies again in the struggle against famine, poverty, terrorism, pollution of the environment, and illnesses?

[Gorbachev] Thank you for remembering that important era of our joint history. We do remember this; we do not forget. As a result of the Geneva meeting, there are, I think possibilities for broad cooperation between our countries and people. And when I say this I do not oversimplify the situation: I know the depth of differences which divide us now and I do recognize the real state of present Soviet-U.S. relations, but I am convinced that this is possible — including cooperation in problems about which you speak.

But I simply do not want to deal with the nuances of these problems now. We can release, if we stop the arms race, vast means to come to the aid of the developing countries. If today in Latin America a vast number of people are starving — and this includes the 50 percent of the children who are suffering from malnutrition, it seems — I have been given data that with a reduction by only some 5 to 10 percent this problem can be removed. [as heard] All this is indeed worthwhile for us to think about. I welcome your question and I think — to reply to it affirmatively — I say that this does not mean certain nuances do not exist between us on these problems, the approach to these problems.

[Question] Good day, my name is Rodgers; I am a correspondent of the American Broadcasting Company in Moscow. [sentence begun in Russian and completed in English]

[Gorbachev] We have met before. [Audience laughter]

[Rodgers, in English with superimposed Russian] You have said that you are disappointed with President Reagan's reply on "star wars." Tell me, please: Is the world a safer place thanks to your meeting?

[Gorbachev] I think I would be taking liberties if I were to claim that even in the presence, that is [rephrases] when there are the same number of weapons after the meeting as before the meeting, that the world has become safer. But in any case, I think the meeting itself, its result, is a definite contribution to the strengthening of security, for it lays the foundations for a path toward understanding, respect, and dialogue — that is, everything which assists the strengthening of security. Thus, I think that in this sense Geneva has had a political effect on us.

[Question] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what specific practical steps could the Soviet Union and the United States take to halt the arms race as soon as possible?

[Gorbachev] It seemed to me that I devoted my entire speech to this. However, I should like to say that we have to stop. If we can avoid an arms race in space, what we have contributed and what the U.S. side has contributed enables us to advance toward each other, to seek compromises, to seek parity at a lower level. I could of course add, there is a good mechanism for this, the Geneva talks. I should like to add further that we hope the U.S. Administration has not yet said its last word on the banning of all tests of nuclear weapons. The whole world is in favor of this, the whole world. The U.S. side still has time to think over the situation. This would be a tremendous step. I think this is another step which would speed up the process of halting the arms race and reducing armaments. I think it would facilitate the process, the Geneva process, and the further intensifying of the political dialogue between USSR and U.S. leaderships. We agreed to expand it and I think the participation of the top leaders of our countries will also facilitate this. And another thing; the subject at Geneva, I refer to the Geneva talks with their known subject and aims, is a matter for all peoples, and each people, and each responsible politician, particularly the head of one state or another, must now take a firm position on this matter. This would be of tremendous significance. I think an absolute, overwhelming majority of politicians favor speeding up the process in Geneva and finding ways to halt the arms race and get on with disarmament.

[Question] GDR Television. I represent GDR television: (Horst Andartin). Comrade General Secretary, I have two questions for you. The first question: Could you please assess again, in your opinion, what results, what outcome, in your opinion, for you, are the most valuable, as one might say the most important from these talks? The second question: This is the second time in a month and a half that you have met leaders from capitalist countries. Could you describe the role or significance of political dialogue at summit level, or at this level at the present time in solving fundamental issues?

[Gorbachev] Is that the first question? The first question...

[Unidentified speaker] No, the first was: What are the most important [words indistinct] and significance.

[Gorbachev] I would stress, in answer to the question, first of all, that the Geneva meeting was an important stage in Soviet-U.S. relations. It lays the foundations for the quest to improve and normalize them on all fronts and in this sense — if it is continued in the future, with joint efforts from both sides - it will further the improvement of the situation in the world. I would say that this is a political result, so to speak.

The Geneva meeting [pauses] at the center of attention during the Geneva meeting were issues which trouble all the peoples of the world. And the joint statement by the leaders of the Soviet Union and United States of America concerning the fact that they consider nuclear war to be an impossibility [nevozmozhnyy], that it cannot be started, that they are not striving for military superiority, that they will give a new impulse to the Geneva process, has in itself enormous significance if it is consistently implemented with practical steps. Well, I also think that this meeting showed that whatever the conditions, we must strive to maintain political dialogue, which would allow the positions to be compared, and enable us to understand one another better on the basis we should search for a mutually acceptable solution to the topical problems of our age.

[Unidentified speaker in French with superimposed translation] The Italian journal *LE MATIN*. Much is said in the Soviet Union about the losses it suffered during the World War II. What does Mr Gorbachev think 40 years after the end of the war; would it be possible to see a reunification of Germany?

[Gorbachev] I think that all these questions were discussed and examined in great depth in the course of the Helsinki process. And the Helsinki process was the common view of all European states, together with the United States and Canada. I think the Helsinki process and all [as heard] and the Final Act signed by all the states deserve to be supported and developed in every way by us, and precisely Helsinki provides the answer to your question too.

[Unidentified speaker] A question there, please.

[Unidentified speaker in French with superimposed translation] You have said you completely disagree with the United States regarding "star wars." Would it be possible to discuss this again?

[Gorbachev] I would have to repeat again to a significant extent what I have already said. But I would just like to express our position in a few words. It amounts to the fact that we are in a constructive frame of mind at the negotiations in Geneva. We will strive to search for solutions in order to stop the arms race and achieve a radical reduction in nuclear armaments, so that later, at some stage of this process, we realistically approach the question of altogether eliminating nuclear weapons, by then with the participation of the entire world community. We say firmly

that this is possible, this achievement would be possible if the door to the arms race, to expanding the arms race in space, were to be tightly shut both by the Soviet Union and by America.

[Unidentified speaker] Your question, please. No, no, no, no, no [words indistinct]

[Unidentified speaker in English with superimposed translation] Thank you. [words indistinct], ASSOCIATED PRESS.

[Unidentified speaker] The ASSOCIATED PRESS agency.

[Unidentified speaker] Go ahead, please.

[Unidentified speaker in English with superimposed translation] Mr Gorbachev, you spoke of the President's personal commitment to the "star wars" program and that you discussed it in detail. How did the President react to your arguments regarding the "star wars" program? Did he evaluate your arguments? Do you see a possibility of shifting this question out of the impasse?

[Gorbachev] I would reply to your question like this. I think the U.S. side has every reason after the meeting to think over all that which we said. We are hoping for an understanding of our arguments. They are founded, we think, on a sense which corresponds to the spirit of the January accord, namely that as a result of the Geneva process, we should enter a road of radical reductions in nuclear weapons on the condition of preventing, with a simultaneous prevention of arms race in space [as heard]. That objective has been defined by us. The President considered it to be a shield, but we have shown, I hope convincingly, that these space weapons could be used equally against missiles, against satellites, and against facilities on earth. These space weapons are a new kind of weapons and thereby, a new sphere of arms race opens up.

Therefore, it is unacceptable. It would complicate the entire situation and make the situation at our negotiations in Geneva very problematic. Therefore, I appreciate that at the President's level and at the CPSU general secretary's level it has been emphasized that the work would be accelerated in Geneva in the course of negotiations on the basis of the January accord. Now this is a point of view reinforced not only by foreign affairs ministers' signatures, but also by state leaders. We view this as a specific signal and hope.

[Unidentified speaker] What is your question, please?

[Unidentified speaker in English, with superimposed translation] Peter Snow, BBC Television "Newsnight" program. Mr General Secretary, I represent the BBC. If you are unable to negotiate an end to the arms race in space, will you be able to keep up with U.S. technology in this field, or will you be left behind?

[Gorbachev] Here you have touched on a very interesting question. I have tried to say to Mr President in a frank and direct conversation that, as it seems to me, much in U.S. policy in relation to the Soviet Union is based on misconceptions. In one case, they have it in their minds, that by the arms race, by continuing it, they will exhaust the Soviet Union economically, weaken its influence in the world, and thus give the United States of America a free hand. History has shamed these prophets. There was a time when our society had different potential and capacities. Now we have tremendous capacities, and this misconception is simply a hindrance to conducting a realistic policy. There have been misconceptions in the military sphere, also. They tried to overtake us, they invented the intercontential ballistic missile; the response came, with a little time lag, but it came. Then multiple warheads appeared. The response came. We have always found a response.

It seems to me that there is an illusion in military circles, which has apparently been transmitted in some degree to political circles, and in particular possibly to the President — though I am not asserting that this is so, but we have formed this impression — that, no, the United States has a certain lead in certain aspects of technology, in particular as regards computer technology and radio technology. Again there appears the desire to seize this and achieve an advantage; and here again that fine winged phrase resounds through the air — Johnson's phrase, President Johnson's. He once said, long ago, that the nation which rules in space will also rule on earth. Some people are rubbing their hands over this; they are so keen, you see, to achieve this world supremacy, to look down on the whole world from above — old ambitions, from those years.

The world has changed a lot in many respects. So if one speaks of this so-called technological superiority which they contemplate realizing with the SDI, thus putting the Soviet Union in a difficult position, this is another misconception. A response will be found. I said to the President: Bear in mind, Mr President, you do not have simpletons sitting in front of you. And if the President was gripped by this idea, then it was my obligation as general secretary — indeed it is the obligation of all the Soviet leadership — to go thoroughly into this; after all, this is the President's point of view to go into this idea. We considered it and came to the conclusion that if we proceed along this road, and there is a certain proposal from the American side, — let's see, let's study it, in general, let us discuss not the question of not permitting the militarization of space, but what weapons to take into space — then we are against this. We are against the race. We analyzed the other side of the question, too. All right, if the United States does not accept our arguments and our good will, so that we could at least start along the road of a reduction in armaments, the reduction of nuclear armaments, those which now exist, and if they take this other course, we shall of course find a response. And the instructions which the Soviet leadership gave in the past to the competent authorites, organizations, and scientists show that our response will be effective, and less expensive, and that it can be implemented in a shorter period.

But our political choice does not consist of this, not of welcoming such a turn of events, that we should proceed along the road of a suitable response to the SDI, but that we should all the same think over the situation and pursue a responsible policy on the basis of commonsense, on the basis of the mood and the longings of people, and not whip up, not complicate, this most acute problem of external international relations.

[Question] Czechoslovak Television and *RUDE PRAVO* newspaper. Comrade Gorbachev, I have a very short question: In which specific and practical spheres can you see the possibilities

for developing Soviet-U.S. relations after the meeting with President Reagan.

[Gorbachev] (?I think) the political dialogue will broaden, we have agreed to visit each other, and the dialogue will be conducted at various levels, consultations will take place. This very fact, I think, has to be welcomed. We shall have opportunities for bilateral cooperation in those spheres on which we have agreed. I think we shall continue and will broaden our consultations on the examination of regional problems and the state of situation in various regions. Finally, we hope that in both our business circles and in U.S. business circles the mutual interest will be preserved. I know this for certain. I think changes in our relations, if they follow such a direction, will also make it possible to develop the scale of this cooperation in this sphere as well.

I tell you that we are ready to invite U.S. business circles to take part in carrying out large projects. We have great plans. We are doing a lot at present with West Europeans to raise higher and to broaden the framework of our economic cooperation; we welcome this. And then I have expressed the view to Mr President: namely that one must not underestimate this sphere of economic mutual relations. First of all, because [pauses] not because America cannot survive without such economic relations or that we cannot survive without America, but, thank God, we shall survive and I hope America will survive too — but because this is a material base for political relations, a base for the improvement of relations, for the creation and formation of a situation of trust and also a broadening of contacts at this level. Openly speaking, through the economy we get more dependent on each other, and this dependence is then also reflected in the solution of political problems. I think the further broadening of economic relations would be in accord with long-term interests of both the Soviet Union and the United States of America; we are not barging in uninvited, for goodness sake. [laughter]

[Unidentified speaker] A last question.

[Gorbachev] Yes, and I shall fly.

[Different unidentified speaker] Last question please.

[Gorbachev] We have not had time to drink our coffee; we shall have a drink on the plane.

[Unidentified speaker in English with superimposed translation] From *ARAB REPORT*, Lebanon. Talking about regional questions, have you discussed the Middle East, and in particular Lebanon? If yes, were the attitudes of the two leaders very much different? What are your assumptions about the further development of events in this region?

[Gorbachev] In our meeting we dealt more with the theoretical side of the problem and, although the regions of Central America, the Near East, and Africa were mentioned, still virtually all the time was devoted to examining the theoretical side of these questions. We agreed to continue political consultations and to expand the framework of interaction on regional problems.

[Unidentified speaker] Mikhail Sergeyevich, as always, the writer Semenov insists. [as heard]

[Gorbachev] I respect the writer Semenov, yet he is also a journalist to a considerable extent.

[Unidentified speaker] Mikhail Sergeyevich, just now you said a find phrase: We must study the art of living together. My experience as a writer says that since the miserable McCarthy era, U.S. films and television have unfortunately drawn an image of Soviet man for the U.S. people as some sort of monster. Do you think that now, after the Geneva meeting, it would be advisable to take a fresh look at such a concept and speak more objectively, so to speak, about the Soviet people as a partner of the U.S. people?

[Gorbachev] You know, Comrade Semenov, I'll put it this way, you shouldn't put all the blame on political leaders. [laughter]. We political leaders have reached agreement to expand cultural contacts and exchanges. This includes the area of movies. You will meet each other so why not reach agreement with each other? [laughter] We must act in the spirit of Geneva, namely in the spirit of facilitating an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. [applause]

Goodbye. I hope we will have more meetings. [applause]

Reagan, Gorbachev at Joint Ceremony 21 Nov

Gorbachev Remarks

LD211003 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0908 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Remarks by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a ceremony held jointly with President Reagan at the Geneva international press center, introduced by Swiss President Furgler — live]

[Text] You have at your disposal the jointly — the jointly agreed — document. The President and I have done a lot of work. We discussed in detail, in depth, and with all frankness and openness a number of very important problems in relations between our countries and the situation in the world today; these were problems the resolution of which affects in the closest way the interests of our peoples and the peoples of other countries. We discussed them proceeding from the intention confirmed by both sides to improve relations between the USSR and the United States and to promote a reduction in the threat of nuclear war, the prevention of the nuclear arms race in space and a halt to it on earth.

In itself we already consider such a discussion useful. Its results are reflected quite fully in the joint statement agreed by the sides.

We have to be realists and say directly: It has not been possible at this meeting to find a solution to the very important issues related to tasks of stopping the arms race and strengthening peace. Major differences between us on matters of principle still remain.

However, the President and I have agreed that work on seeking mutually acceptable solutions of these most important questions will be persistently continued here in Geneva by our representatives. We will also be seeking new forms of developing bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. There also lie ahead further consultations on a number of regional problems on which our positions in the majority of cases are completely different.

Searches for new forms of development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations also lie ahead. Further consultations also lie ahead on a numbber of regional problems on which our positions, in the majority of cases are completely different. We consider all this — that is, the forthcoming discussions — to be useful. But the real significance of everything which the President and I agreed upon can only show itself in specific, practical deeds.

If we really want to achieve something both sides need to do a lot of work in the spirit of the joint statement which we have adopted. I would like in this connection to state that the Soviet Union for its part will make every effort, in cooperation with the United States of America, to achieve a practical solution of the tasks of curtailing the arms race, reducing stockpiled arsenals, and ensuring the conditions for a stable peace between our peoples and reliable peace on earth and in space.

We state this with a full awareness of our responsibility before our own people and before other peoples of the world. We would very much like to count on the same responsible approach on the part of the Administration of the United States of America. Then the work which has been done in these days in Geneva will not be in vain.

I would like, in conclusion, to sincerely thank the Government of Switzerland for the conditions it created for our work.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Reagan Remarks

LD211339 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 21 TASS — Speaking at the concluding ceremony of the Soviet-American summit meeting here today President Reagan of the United States said the following:

President Furgler,

General Secretary Gorbachev,

May I express Nancy's and my deep personal appreciation and that of all Americans to the people of Switzerland who are welcoming us so warmly and preparing the foundations for productive discussions. Yours is a long and honourable tradition of promoting international peace and understanding. You should take pride in being the capital for international discussions. So again to the Government of Switzerland and to the citizens of Geneva many, many thanks.

We packed a lot into the last two days. I came to Geneva to seek a fresh start in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and we have done this. General Secretary Gorbachev and I have held comprehensive discussions covering all elements of our relationship. I am convinced we're heading in the right direction.

We've reached some useful interim results which are described in the joint statement that is being issued this morning. In agreeing to accelerate the work of our nuclear arms negotiators Mr Gorbachev and I have addressed our common responsibility to strengthen peace. I believe that we have established a process for more intensive contacts between the United States and the Soviet Union. These two days of talks should inject a certain momentum into our work on the issues between us, a momentum we can continue at the meeting that we have agreed on for next year.

Before coming to Geneva I spoke often of the need to build confidence in our dealings with each other. Frank and forthright conversations at the summit are part of this process. But I am certain General Secretary Gorbachev would agree that real confidence in each other must be built on deeds not simply words. This is the thought that ties together all the proposals that the United States has put on the table in the past and this is the criteria by which our meetings will be judged in the future. The real report card on Geneva will not come in for months or even years. But we know the questions tht must be answered: Will we join together in sharply reducing offensive nuclear arms and moving to non-nuclear defensive strength with systems to make this a safer world? Will we join together to help bring about a

peaceful resolution of conflicts in Asia, Africa and Central America so that the peoples there can freely determine their own destiny without outside interference? Will the cause of liberty be advanced and will the treaties and agreements signed, past and future, be fulfilled? The people of America, the Soviet Union and throughout the world are ready to answer "yes".

I leave Geneva today and our fireside summit determined to pursue every opportunity to build a safer world of peace and freedom. There is hard work ahead. We are ready for it.

General Secretary Gorbachev, we ask you to join us in getting the job done, as I am sure you will.

Thank you.

Further Summit Planned

AU210955 Paris AFP in English 0952 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, Nov 21 (AFP) — U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev announced here today they have agreed on a further summit next year, in the most positive outcome to this week's superpower summit here. Mr. Reagan made the statement at a joint ceremony at Geneva's international press center here with Swiss president Kurt Furgler and Mr. Gorbachev, who spoke first. The U.S. and Soviet leaders also indicated that they had accepted mutual invitations to visit each other's countries, at date to be arranged.

In a joint delcaration, they also also agreed to speed up the ongoing nuclear and space arms limitation negotiations here, calling for rapid progress, particularly where ideas converged. These included the prinicple of a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear arms by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The closure ceremony began at the summit conference centre soon after 10 a.m. (0900 GMT). The two leaders, flanked by the U.S. and Soviet flags, had also agreed on several bilateral accords.

In the delcaration they recognised they had differences but said they agreed on the need to improve superpower relations and the overall international situation. They accepted the principle of future summits at dates to be agreed. The two superpowers also backed negotiations on the idea of an interim agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles.

On improving ties with the United States, Mr. Gorbachev said that "if we really want to succeed, both sides will have to do an awful lot of work in connection with the joint statement." He added that Moscow would do "all it can" with the United States to achieve practical results in order to cut down the arms race and would do "everything necessary for peace on earth and in space." He said he was hoping for the "same approach" from the United States.

Joint Statement

LD211115 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 21 Nov 85

["Joint Soviet American Statement" — TASS headline]

[Text] Geneva, November 21 TASS — By mutual agreement, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan met in Geneva November 19-21, 1985.

Attending the meeting on the Soviet side were member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko, the USSR's Ambassador to the United States Anatoliy Dobrynin, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev, head of the international Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Zamyatin, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Andrey Aleksandrov. On the American side — U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Chief of Staff Donald Regan, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Robert McFarlane, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Arthur Hartman, special adviser to the president and the Secretary of State for Arms Control Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway, special assistant to the President Jack Matlock.

These comprehensive exchanges of opinions covered the basic questions of Soviet-American relations and the current international situation. The discussions were frank and useful. Serious differences remain on a number of key issues.

While acknowledging the differences in the socio-political systems of the USSR and the United States and their approaches to international problems, some greater understanding of each other's view was achieved by the two leaders. They agreed about the need to improve Soviet-American relations and the international situation as a whole. In this connection the two sides confirmed the importance of an ongoing dialogue, reflecting their strong desire to seek common ground on existing problems.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States agreed to meet again in the near future. In this connection the U.S. President accepted an invitation by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to visit the Soviet Union. For his part, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee accepted an invitation by the President of the United States to visit the United States of America. Arrangements for and timing of the visits will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

At their meetings, agreement was reached on some specific issues. Areas of agreement are registered below.

1. [as received]

The sides, having discussed key security issues, and conscious of the special responsibility of the USSR and the USA for maintaining peace, are stating that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Recognizing that any conflict between the

USSR and the USA could have catastrophic consequences, they emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not seek to achieve military superiority.

The general secretary and the President discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

They agreed to accelerate the work at these negotiations, with a view to accomplishing the tasks set down in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8, 1985, namely: to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability.

Noting the proposals recently tabled by the Soviet Union and the United States, they called for early progress, in particular in areas where there is common ground, including the principle of 50 per cent reductions in the nuclear arms of the sides appropriately applied, as well as the idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. During the elaboration of these agreements, effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations assumed will be agreed upon.

The sides agreed to study the question at the expert level of centres to reduce nuclear risk taking into account the issues and developments in the Geneva negotiations. They noted with satisfaction such recent steps in this direction as the modernization of the Soviet-U.S. hotline.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan reaffirmed the commitment of the USSR and the U.S. to the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and their interest in strengthening together with other countries the non-proliferation regime, and in further enhancing the effectiveness of the treaty, inter alia by enlarging its membership.

They note with satisfaction the overall positive results of the recent review conference of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The USSR and the U.S. reaffirm their commitment, assumed by them under the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to pursue negotiations in good faith on matters of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament in accordance with Article V of the treaty.

The two sides plan to continue to promote the strengthening of the International Atomic Energy Agency and to support the activities of the agency in implementing safeguards as well as in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They view positively the practice of regular Soviet-U.S. consultations on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which have been businesslike and constructive and express the intent to continue this practice in the future.

In the context of discussing security problems, the two sides reaffirmed that they are in favor of a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. They agreed to accelerate efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on this matter.

The two sides agreed to intensify bilateral discussions on the level of experts on all aspects of such a chemical weapons ban, including the question of verification. They agreed to initiate a dialogue on preventing the proliferation of chemical weapons.

The two sides emphasized the importance they attach to the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and expressed their willingness to work for positive results there.

Attaching great importance to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and noting the progress made there, the two sides stated their intention to facilitate, together with the other participating states, an early and successful completion of the work of the conference. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for a document which would both include mutually acceptable confidence- and security-building measures and give concrete expression and effect to the principle of non-use of force.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan agreed on the need to place on a regular basis and intensify dialogue at various levels. Along with meetings between the leaders of the two countries, this envisages regular meetings between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state, as well as between the heads of other ministries and agencies. They agree that the recent mutual visits by the heads of ministries and departments in such fields as agriculture, housing and protection of the environment have been useful.

Recognizing the usefulness of the already held exchanges of views on regional issues, including those at expert level, they agreed to continue such exchanges on a regular basis.

The sides intend to expand the programs of bilateral, cultural, educational, scientific-technical exchanges, and also to develop trade and economic ties. The general secretary and the President attended the signing of the agreement on contacts and exchanges in scientific, educational and cultural fields.

They believe that there should be greater understanding between our peoples and that to this end they will encourage greater travel and people-to-people contact.

The sides agree on the importance of resolving matters concerning individual citizens in the spirit of cooperation.

The two leaders noted with satisfaction that, in cooperation with the Government of Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to a set of measures to promote safety on air routes in the north Pacific and have worked out steps to implement them.

They acknowledged that delegations from the USSR and the USA have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement on that score at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates-general in New York and Kiev respectively.

Both sides agreed to contribute to the preservation of the environment — a global task — through joint research and practical measures. In accordance with the existing Soviet-American agreement in this area, consultations will be held next year in Moscow and Washington on specific programs of cooperation.

The two leaders agreed on the utility of broadening exchanges and contacts including some of their new forms in a number of scientific, educational, medical and sports fields (inter alia, cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction; measures to promote Russian language studies in the United States and English language studies in the USSR; the annual exchange of professors to conduct special courses in history, culture and economics at the relevant departments of Soviet and American institutions of higher education; mutual allocation of scholarships for the best students in the natural sciences, technology, social sciences and humanities for the period of an academic year; holding regular meets in various sports and increased television coverage of sports events). The two sides agreed to resume cooperation in combating cancer diseases.

The relevant agencies in each of the countries are being instructed to develop specific programmes for these exchanges. The resulting programmes will be examined by the leaders of the two countries at their next meeting.

The two leaders emphasized the potential importance of the work aimed at utilizing controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes and, in this connection, advocated the widest practicable development of international cooperation in obtaining this source of energy, which is essentially inexhaustible, for the benefit of all mankind.

Further Reportage on 20 Nov Proceedings

'Difficulties' in Conversations

LD202100 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by special correspondents Valentin Zorin and Boris Kalygin from Geneva]

[Text] In Geneva the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan continued today. Today the talks took place in the building of the Soviet mission to the United Nations in Geneva. At 1000 local time President Reagan arrived at the Soviet mission building. He was greeted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Journalists had been granted an opportunity to photograph and film the meeting between the leaders of the two powers, who spent about 1 hour in conversation with only interpreters present. After this, the conversation was continued with the participation of Soviet and U.S. officials.

During these conversations, in which difficulties sometimes arose, fundamental questions, on whose resolution much depends in the modern world, were discussed. The sides are setting forth their positions and seeking mutually acceptable solutions.

After a brief interval, the day's second meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President took place. Representatives of the world's leading news agencies, television, press, and radio gathered at the Soviet mission. They are utilizing the slightest opportunity to shed light on what is going on behind the closed doors of the halls in which the conversations are taking place, and, whenever possible, from a primary source.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] I think that both men and women in the Soviet Union, in the United States, and all other countries, are concerned that peace should be preserved. And moreover they are concerned that there should be confidence in the future, in that peace should be solid and lasting. For this purpose they wish there to be fewer weapons. Thus, the questions of curbing nuclear weapons and about how to stop the arms race are at the center of our discussions.

[Question indistinct]

[Gorbachev] They are not over yet.

[Question] What progress (?have you made)?

[Gorbachev] You will find out everything tomorrow. [Video shows Reagan looking on as Gorbachev talks to journalists. Reagan and Gorbachev then turn and enter building.] [end recording]

Gorbachev, Reagan Attend Reception

LD201912 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 20 Nov 85

["Reception on the Occasion of Meeting in Geneva" — TASS headline]

[Text] Geneva, 20 Nov (TASS) — Today representatives of the Swiss Confederation and the authorities of the City of Geneva organized a reception on the occasion of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, U.S. President Ronald Reagan, and official Soviet and U.S. figures taking part in the meeting were at the reception. They were greeted by the Swiss president, Kurt Furgler, the head of the Geneva canton government, (?Jacques Vernay), and the mayor of the city, (?Rene Emmenegger).

Mikhail Gorbachev, Ronald Reagan, and Kurt Furgler signed the golden honorary guest book.

Talks Conclude

LD201837 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2335 GMT 20 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, 20 Nov (TASS) — Negotiations between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan continued in Geneva at the Soviet mission today.

The negotiations began with a one-to-one conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. They were then continued with the participation of:

Eduard Shevardnadze, Georgiy Korniyenko, Anatoliy Dobrynin, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Leonid Zamyatin, and Andrey Aleksandrov on the Soviet side.

George Shultz, Donald Regan, Robert McFarlane, Arthur Hartman, and Rozanne Ridgway on the U.S. side.

At a concluding session in the afternoon Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan summed up the meetings and conversations that took place in Geneva over the course of 2 days.

In the evening the U.S. President gave a dinner in honor of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged brief toasts.

Gorbachev Remarks to Newsmen

LD202125 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 20 Nov 85

[Text] The final session was held on Wednesday afternoon at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, summed up the results of their 2-day talks.

The Swiss Government and the Geneva town hall held a reception on the occasion of the meeting of the Soviet and American leaders. The reception was attended by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, who were welcomed by the President of Switzerland, Kurt Furgler.

Answering newsmen's questions in the intermission between the sessions, the Soviet leader said he considered the very fact of his meeting with President Reagan quite important. We are discussing major questions that worry all people, Mikhail Gorbachev said. He called the Soviet-American dialogue responsible and the tone of the talks businesslike and sincere. There are difficulties, Mikhail Gorbachev said, connected with differences in the approach of the sides to certain problems. Questions of war and peace were in the center of attention of the sides. The Soviet leader stressed that the peoples of the USSR and the United States and other countries were interested in preserving peace. They want to be sure that peace will be stable. That's why, said Mikhail Gorbachev, the reduction of nuclear armaments was the central question of our discussions.

A spokesman for the Soviet delegation announced that Mikhail Gorbachev would hold a news conference on Thursday morning.

Further on Gorbachev Remarks

LD201905 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] At the closing session in the afternoon, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan summed up the results of the meetings and conversations which took place in Geneva over the past 2 days.

[Unidentified correspondent] The interest of the representatives of the world press present in Geneva in the conversations between the leaders of the USSR and the United States is enormous. As is known, the participants in the meeting have agreed that until it ends they will not report on the progress of the conversations. Thus, it is not surprising that the observers who spend the entire day in the halls of the press center greedily pick up every word on the basis of which a judgment may be made about what is happening at the negotiating table.

The report delivered today to Soviet and foreign correspondents by Comrade Zamyatin, head of the Department of International Information of the CPSU Central Committee, was heard with great attention. He said:

[Zamyatin] It is natural that the central question, that of war and peace and of limiting the arms race, is the center of attention. I would like to say that today, when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke to journalists and replied to their questions, he said: The fact that the meeting itself has taken place, and that an analysis is in progress of the major questions concerning the world situation and of those problems which are of concern to the Soviet people and those of the United States and other countries, is in itself very important. He also said: A responsible conversation is taking place, and we are discussing the things that every country considers essential to discuss.

When you inquired about the atmosphere in which the negotiations are taking place, he [as heard] said that they were being held in a spirit of frankness, in a businesslike manner. It is natural that there should be difficulties too, connected with the different positions of the countries regarding some key questions. That is all I wanted to tell you about today's talks.

The second thing I would like to tell you is that the press conference by the Soviet delegation, which has already been announced here, will take place tomorrow in the press center of the USSR mission to the United Nations. The press conference will be conducted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

U.S. Endorses Description

LD202123 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1939 GMT 20 Nov 85

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Hundreds of journalists dealing with the Geneva meetings are impatiently waiting for news. Representatives of the two delegations responsible for the press appear from time to time. Larry Speakes, leader of the White House press service, in response to correspondents questions, has declared that the U.S. side fully shares the evaluation of the atmosphere of the meeting given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who described it as businesslike.

Gorbachev, Soviet Delegation Depart Geneva

LD211323 Moscow TASS in English 1308 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] [no dateline as received] — The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee left Geneva on November 21. The state flags of the USSR and Switzerland were hoisted at the airport in honour of the high Soviet guest. At the plane's ramp Mikhail Gorbachev was accompanied by President Kurt Furgler of the Swiss Confederation. Among the send-off party were Pierre Aubert, head of the Swiss Foreign Affairs Department, Ivan Ippolitov, the ambassador of the USSR to Switzerland, Mikhail Sytenko, permanent representative of the USSR at the U.N. office and at other international organizations in Geneva, and other Swiss and Soviet officials.

The following officials who took part in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting left Geneva as well: Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Anatoliy Dobrynin, the ambassador of the USSR to the USA, Aleksandr Yakovlev, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, Andrey Aleskandrov, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Further Report

AU211225 Paris AFP in English 1223 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, Nov 21 (AFP) — Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev left here with his wife Raisa for Prague at 1:16 p.m. (1216 GMT), following his summit with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, Swiss television said.

He was seen of by Swiss President Kurt Furgler, on an Aeroflot special Ilyushin-62 flight.

Reagan Departs Geneva for Brussels 21 Nov

LD211348 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 21 TASS — U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who together with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, participated in the Soviet-American summit negotiations, left Geneva for Brussels today.

Pessimism at Talks Termed 'Inappropriate'

LD202029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 20 Nov 85

(From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The dialogue between the two great powers — The Soviet Union and the United States — is continuing intensively in Geneva; that is how foreign journalists and television reporters — some 3,500 of them according to some reports — are reporting the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. Today it is taking place at the residence of our delegation, which is situated not far from the Palais Des Nations.

TASS has put out an official report: Talks were continued at the Soviet representation in Geneva on 20 November between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

The talks began with a one-to-one conversation between the two leaders, then they continued with the participation of the other Soviet and U.S. representatives.

As is known, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have agreed to not inform the press about the specific contents of the conversations until they are over. Western journalists, accustomed to sensationalism, immediately became gloomy, and the U.S. expression blackout could be glimpsed fleetingly in reports from the foreign agencies, that is, that there will not be any information at all.

The issues being discussed at the summit meeting are too serious, and touch on the fate of all mankind, for them to give cause to false interpretations and speculation. But pessimism, it seems to me, is inappropriate; after all, it is not without reason that they say that pessimism is a mood, while optimism is an act of will [pessimizm eto nstroyeniye, a optimizm volya]. Nothing gives grounds for being in a somber mood, as both sides, judging by everything, are manifestating the urge to conduct serious talks. Before the start of today's meeting, President Reagan described yesterday's discussions as good. Replying to journalists, an AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE correspondent reports from Geneva: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said before the start of the recent meeting with Ronald Reagan that yesterday's discussions on all issues was very animated, frank, and serious.

An atmosphere of expectancy is reigning in the international press center where journalists, cinema, and television operatives, who have come to Geneva from various countries, are working

intensively day and night. The press center's work continues round the clock: thousands of telegraph and radio communications channels link it with the five continents. Swiss television has organized direct transmissions from various countries; they can be followed without going out of the building on a large screen in the main hall. In the press center and at the place of the main events, where the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is being held, special correspondents from Soviet television can be found; you see their reports every day on the "Vremya" program, and now their colleagues, correspondents from other countries, have spied on how they work and captured it on videotape.

Today this report arrived from Geneva via the video channels. [Video shows Raisa Gorbacheva and Nancy Reagan at Red Cross ceremony]

In the city where the Soviet-U.s. summit meeting is being held, a ceremony took place for laying the foundation stone for the International Red Cross museum. This emblem is known throughout the world; it symbolizes the ideas of humanism and aid to people who have come to grief. More than once I have had occasion to see the emblem of the International Red Cross during military conflicts in the Near East. Today this emblem can also be seen in Colombia, whose inhabitants have suffered from a terrible volcanic eruption.

But let us return to Geneva. Guests of honor at the ceremony were Raisa Maksimovna Gorbachev and Nancy Reagan. A capsule containing a message in Russian, English, and French was placed in the stone symbolizing the laying of the foundation stone for the International Red Cross museum in Geneva; it was signed by Raisa Gorbacheva, Nancy Reagan, and the wife of the Swiss President, Furgler.

Millions of people throughout the world await positive results from the meeting of the leaders of the two great powers. Soviet peaceful initiatives have given grounds for such hopes: our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests the proposal on radical cutbacks in nuclear arms, and Moscow's persistent efforts to stop the arms race from spreading to space. But the Geneva meeting is evoking not just good hopes connected with the struggle of all mankind for the right to live, but also misgivings from the arms manufacturers from across the ocean about their multibillion-dollar profits. As a consultant from one of the largest U.S. military concerns has stated quite frankly, a softening in relations between Moscow and Washington is a poor prospect for the U.S. military budget. According to *THE WASHINGTON POST* newspaper, the Pentagon contractors are worried that the United States and the United States — forgive me, that the Soviet Union and the United States — might come to an accord on effective arms verification. One should not forget about all this.

The Geneva meeting and the UN General Assembly in New York are working on the same wavelength; the assembly's special political committee today began discussing one of the most important issues on the agenda: international cooperation in the use of space for peaceful purposes. The USSR's proposals on the basic directions and principles of such cooperation in conditions of the nonmilitarization of space are the center of attention. It is stressed in these proposals that space is the common property of mankind and must serve not war, but peace and security, and the economic and social progress of all peoples. The path to this lies through joint, collective efforts by all states.

Coverage of Summit by U.S. Newsmen Critiqued

PM201612 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 85 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Mikhail Ozerov dispatch: "Backstage Intrigues at the Intercontinental"]

[Text] Geneva — Policemen check passes at the entrance of the Intercontinental Hotel. They are kept busy. One of Geneva's most fashionable hotels has now become the American press center. The hall on the second floor is particularly crowded. It is highly impressive: wood-paneled walls, massive gilt chandeliers, and a large television screen on which journalists can watch events connected with the summit meeting...

Unfortunately, what takes place in the hall is by no means always as solid or substantial.

...The U.S. experts are surrounded by a crowd of journalists. The interview lasts for over 40 minutes, yet all this time the specialists from Washington repeat the same thing: there is no military equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, and the United States is "lagging behind the Soviet Union," particularly in strategic offensive weapons.

The "evidence" they offer follows the hackneyed pattern: they overstate the quantity of Soviet missiles, do not take British and French weapons into account, classify as withdrawn from West Europe nuclear charges which have in fact been simply replaced, and so on and so forth. This is by no means innocent juggling with facts. Its corollary is that the United States must catch up, build up, introduce... The reporters diligently take notes. In a few hours' time these statements, bolstered by "precise figures" which in fact distort the truth, will appear in the newspapers and will bombard people from television screens and radio receivers.

Nearby, an activist of the organization "Americans for the Strategic Defense Initiative" is explaining to correspondents how much the notorious U.S. SDI is supposedly needed "for the strengthening of peace." This group is working hard in Geneva, as are, incidentally, other "peacemakers" who, if the official story is to be believed, have come to Geneva to "support" their president but in fact hinder the course of the summit meeting. They are not only granting interviews all over the place, but are also distributing all kind of documents, press releases, and bulletins which lie in heaps everywhere in the Intercontinental.

There is another unseemly scene in another corner of the hall. An anti-Sovietist expelled from our country is holding forth before a microphone, while writers and cameramen enthusiastically record his every word and every gesture.

When the official U.S. spokesman mounts the rostrum, one sometimes gets the impression that he is interested not so much in news on the course of the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, but in "feeding" reporters who are after something "hot." Some of the statements and evaluations that have been made at official press conferences in the Intercontinental cannot fail to cause amazement, to put it mildly. For example, the claim that "the buildup of the two sides' military potentials is not proceeding in a balanced fashion, and we (the United States — M.O.) have to catch up with the Soviet Union." So this is why the United States boosted this year's Pentagon budget to over $300 billions, this is why it is augmenting the nuclear arsenals at its military bases and is accelerating the buildup of strategic missiles and, in particular, the creation of 50 MX ICBM's!

"Do you believe that the Soviet Union really is far superior to the United States in the arms sphere?", I asked *WASHINGTON POST* correspondent Peter (Almondo), who sat next to me.

His reply lasted 15 minutes. It is clear from his words that (Almondo) agrees with the claims about "imbalance" and "Moscow's aggressiveness" and believes it is necessary to embark on the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative." However, it turns out that he does not know the most elementary things about SDI. For instance, the fact that the project will cost a truly fantastic sum (some scientists say $300 billion, others $1 trillion). He is also ignorant of the fact that the much-vaunted SDI is incapable of destroying a whole series of types of weapons and at the same time creates the illusion of the advantageousness of a first strike; that is, it increases the danger of a nuclear conflict.

Yet this is not just a journalist's personal opinion. He imposes his point of view on the readers of one of the most influential newspapers in the United States. Talking with him and observing how his colleagues fuss over any petty provocateur and how they snatch at any sensation, however cheap, you ask yourself the question again and again: Do they really not understand that the question of what the international climate will be like is currently being resolved in Geneva? Of course they do. But they do not want to abandon their approach and the jarring stereotypes about "Russian supremacy," the "Red threat," and others and close their eyes to the real facts. This same Peter (Almondo), when I reminded him of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff report which put the approximate military parity between the United States and the Soviet Union in black and white, just waved his hand dismissively.

In his replies to *TIME* magazine, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that "the main question which we must answer for ourselves is whether we are finally ready to admit that there is no other way except to live in peace with each other and whether we are prepared to readjust our way of thinking and acting from a military to a peaceful way." The members of the U.S. "force" that has landed in Geneva clearly answer that question in the negative.

As a result, they discredit themselves. As a Swiss radio commentator aptly noted, these actions look like "petty behind-the-scenes intrigues"...

Certain U.S. correspondents were not pleased that M.S. Gorbachev met with Jesse Jackson and other representatives of major U.S. antiwar movements and organizations. Yet these people look at the world situation realistically, realize where the danger comes from, and sincerely want the threat of nuclear war to be reduced and international relations to be improved as a result of the Geneva talks.

The U.S. war veterans who have come to Geneva also want this. They met with Soviet soldiers on the Elbe in August 1945 and realize how important joint efforts are in the struggle for peace.

...The flags of the United States and Switzerland are flying outside the Intercontinental. Beneath them is an enormous banner which depicts a dove of peace alongside the words "Welcome to the summit!" How nice it would be if those who are currently renting the Intercontinental Hotel took a look at that dove more often.

Talks, Events, News Coverage in Geneva Reviewed

PM201709 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Nov 85 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Special correspondents B. Ivanov, S. Kondrashov and V. Kuznetsov dispatch: "The Fleur d'Eau Villa, Geneva"]

[Text] These days in Geneva newspaper correspondents like us are engaged in a difficult, if not hopeless race against the clock and, of course, the television screens. We have long been losing this skirmish. It is also hard for newspaper accounts to compete in expressiveness, clarity, and immediacy with television pictures, which everyone has had time to see.

After the first session on Tuesday, the news was announced soon after midday in the gigantic press center building that by joint agreement both sides had decided to refrain from any comment or explanation on the substance of the questions under discussion until the Geneva meeting was over.

Thus, the work for which the two states' leaders are meeting here was freed from superfluous obstacles and extraneous features. And there are already more than enough of those in Soviet-U.S. relations. Furthermore, the opponents of the Geneva meeting would not be averse to creating new obstacles right now. Unfortunately, there are enough people of that kind in certain circles in the West, particularly in the United States itself.

Nevertheless, we newspaper correspondents still have an opportunity to share with readers our observations from the first day of the meeting.

Tuesday morning was cold, with a piercing wind. At about 0900 hours we drove to Versoix, a Geneva suburb. The dense streams of our automobiles met those of the people of Geneva, hurrying the other way to work.

After we journalists fortunate enough to witness the meeting had our passes checked, we were allowed onto the grounds where a still green hedge led up to a three-story gray stone detached mansion.

We were among a small group of journalists allowed to enter the villa itself for two brief photographic and viewing sessions. We waited among the other lucky journalists standing in the wind and cold behind the metal barrier very strictly protected by trained and sharp-eyed guards.

On our left at arm's length was the righthand flight of steps of a curved staircase which the two main participants in the meeting were to ascend before disappearing into the house. Facing us was the larger, but less fortunate army of journalists standing noisily on a many-tiered wooden platform around an old plane tree with a bare trunk and spreading branches on which a few leaves still fluttered at the other end of the gray gravel driveway: Those journalists had to leave the grounds of the Fleur d'Eau immediately after the photograph session.

Then, at 0948 hours, the shiny black Cadillac bearing the presidential insignia stopped at an oblique angle from us, opposite the villa entrance. Accompanied by White House Chief of Staff D. Regan, President Reagan emerged from the car holding a bundle of papers in his right hand and hurried inside the building to emerge later to meet the Soviet guest on schedule.

At exactly 1000 hours the soft crunch of tires on the gravel was heard and another large black limousine, bearing the Soviet flag, appeared before us. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had arrived at the venue of the first meeting.

The President went down to the guest's car. The two leaders shook hands to the whirring of movie cameras and the clicking of cameras; then went up the stairs and stopped in front of the doors. They stood there together. We heard Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev joke to Ronald Reagan: "You are lightly dressed. Do not catch cold or I will have no one to hold talks with." At that particular moment the interpreters were elsewhere and the President, hearing unfamiliar Russian speech, said nothing but gave a tight-lipped smile in reply. That was how they met, the two state leaders, for the first Soviet-U.S. summit in the past 6 years or more. And they went into the building together, lost to view.

Entering the small blue salon a little later through a side door, accompanied by guards, we saw them sitting next to each other near some bookshelves. Wishes for success were heard from our group. M.S. Gorbachev replied: "We attach great importance to the meeting in Geneva," he said, "and we realize that the Soviet Union and the United States are interconnected [vzaimosvyazany] and that we cannot scorn each other's interests or fail to consider in our policy the interests of other countries and peoples." The President waited for the general secretary's words to be translated for him. "I agree," he said, having heard the translation. We asked R. Reagan what he expects from the meeting. "I am hoping for the best," the President replied. "I second that," the Soviet leader commented.

Then the two leaders remained alone with just their interpreters. And we lucky ones, hunched inside our coats and raincoats, waited by the gray mansion to be summoned inside for 2-3 minutes after the meeting alone and before the two sides conferred on a broader basis. The electric atmosphere of a tremendous event taking place right next to us helped us endure the Geneva cold, unusual for weather in November.

The Soviet and U.S. leaders have met for the first time after long years of mounting tension in relations between the two countries and after a long wait for changes for the better. A favorable sign was seen by eyewitnesses in the fact that they shook hands, smiled, and exchanged courteous words.

In our nuclear age neither of the two sides can win and both must simply reach an understanding. And on the outward, purely visual level, standing a few steps away, you formed the impression that it was not that difficult to reach an understanding. A purely outward impression, a purely visual and, of course, superficial impression.

It is easy to guess that the gigantic differences in the two countries' foreign policies and socioeconomic systems and in the world outlook and philosophy of a U.S. conservative and a Soviet Communist have not disappeared because they have met under the sky of neutral Switzerland and under the same roof of an old Geneva mansion. But the political distance separating us can be reduced if both sides are aware of their interconnection and the degree of their responsibility at this critical moment in history. In his statement immediately before his first talk with R. Reagan, M.S. Gorbachev indicated a good way toward this: not scorning each other's interests, but taking into account the other side's interests in one's policy.

Their first talk alone was timed by journalists at 1 hour 4 minutes, twice as long as initially proposed. The remaining participants in the talks waited for the two leaders in a ground-floor drawing room, clearly visible to us through the large windows. When press representatives were allowed inside again, this time into the drawing room, approximately 20 high-ranking officials were standing round a large oval table and at the end opposite two us were the two leaders next to each other.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich, what is your first impression?" someone from our group asked across the table. M.S. Gorbachev answered with three words: "Work has begun."

...We left the Fleur d'Eau villa. Meanwhile, state work continued even after dinner. It was reported later that the two delegations sat for approximately an hour in plenary session [v shirokom sostave]. Then, the President invited his guest to take a walk in the park surrounding the villa and during the walk the two leaders had another talk alone lasting approximately an hour, retiring to a summerhouse near the lakeside...

As we have already reported, Geneva has now become a temporary Mecca for representatives of the broadest movement for peace, which is turning a hopeful gaze toward the participants in the summit meeting. They include the British priest Bruce Kent, who used to head the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and the Japanese "hibakushi" — victims of the nuclear bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, who have borne the burden of the tragedy all their lives. But, perhaps the largest number of peace pilgrims came from the United States. The antiwar movement

across the ocean is demanding that official Washington follow the course of peace, not confrontation; of the reduction of nuclear arsenals, not their buildup; and of the prevention of the militarization of space, not its transformation into a field of military confrontation.

The Americans who have flown into Geneva include the well-known U.S. public figure Jesse Jackson. With other U.S. peace champions,he asked to be received by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. The President declined the request for a personal meeting, directing a State Department spokesman to talk with Jesse Jackson.

For his part, M.S. Gorbachev received Jesse Jackson and with him a large group of U.S. peace champions from various organizations. In the Soviet mission club on the Avenue de la Paix we saw a dense circle of several rows of people surrounding the Soviet leader. Jesse Jackson spoke of the need to put an end to the arms race and urged the participants in the Soviet-U.S. meeting to remember that constructive results are expected from it; not only in the United States and the USSR, but also throughout the rest of the world where, he said, seven-eighths of mankind live. Answering the American in detail, M.S. Gorbachev spoke of his understanding of these problems, of the Soviet people's kind feelings for the U.S. people, and of how one should not succumb to tiredness in seeking the consolidation of peace and good relations between peoples.

When the talk came to an end the U.S. men and women — there were many women in the group — approached a table next to the wall. They carried thick piles of papers covered in signatures. The mountain of papers grew on the table and next to it. On the floor were cardboard boxes, also containing petitions: 1.5 million Americans' signatures had been collected by antiwar group demanding a freeze on nuclear arsenals and the total prohibition of nuclear tests.

After the meeting Jesse Jackson told Soviet journalists that he had been greatly impressed by the Soviet leader's openness and warmth and his capacity for understanding.

We also spoke with the American Susan (Gershkovich), coordinator of the "women for a fruitful summit meeting" organization. She said:

"The organizations we represent are varied. But we are united in one thing. It is essential to reverse the arms race, not to allow it into space, and to stop throwing to the wind money which is needed so badly for resolving social tasks. We appeal to the two countries' leaders: Give us hope, stop the dangerous advance to the nuclear abyss."

Another woman with whom we talked represents an unusual but, she believes, most humane organization — "grandmothers for peace."

"The idea that my 10 childen and 9 grandchildren will burn in a nuclear conflagration," Barbara (Vidner) said, "made me appeal to the women of America: 'the desire to use nuclear weapons is a moral crime.' Our grandchildren — and you cannot but love them — must not be the last generation on earth. That is why I am in Geneva."

When the meeting at the Soviet mission ended, the U.S. men and women emerged like people who had fulfilled a sacred duty and they moved unhurriedly, in small groups, down the Avenue de la Paix which on that cold November day had lived up to its name — the street of peace.

Washington 'Hawks' Nervous About Results of Talks

LD180724 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 18 TASS — "Those in Washington who are opposed to the settlement of contentious international issues through talks are on the tenterhooks today," Vitaliy Korionov says in *PRAVDA*. "They are incensed at the very thought that the Soviet-American Geneva summit can lead to the relaxation of tension. The entire arsenal of countermeasures available to those dark forces has been brought into play.

"The military-industrial complex, *THE WASHINGTON POST* reports, has set up something like a 'star complex,' which incorporates lobbyists pushing the 'star wars' program and presidents of corporations filling orders for that program. The 'star complex' is hoping to protect fresh opportunities for business from any threat, including arms control agreements."

"So a report devoted to U.S. military policy in outer space has been produced by a commission under former Presidential National Security adviser Scowcroft. It claims that the militarization of space has already begun and that it is impossible to stop.

"The Pentagon bosses are busy as well. Defense Secretary Weinberger is trying to prove that the only way to conduct talks effectively is to conduct them from positions of strength. The point is not the Soviet Union's goodwill but U.S. strength, he claims. He is echoed by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Lugar, who has stated in all seriousness that Moscow has come up with new peace proposals because of the U.S. 'Strategic Defense Initiative.' The SDI has already ensured the first tangible success, according to him.

"The 'hawks,' to all appearances, are not going to give up their acts of subversion," the author concludes.

Soviet Envoy in Nicaragua Previews Summit Topics

PA200235 Managua Radio Sandino in Spanish 1930 GMT 19 Nov 85

[Text] German Shlyapnikov, Soviet ambassador to Nicaragua, said today to Radio Informaciones that it is expected an agreement will be signed following talks between Ronald Reagan, president of the United States, and Mikhail Gorbachev, secretary general of the CPSU, to establish a military balance between the two powers, but lowering the current buildup.

The Soviet diplomat said that the Reagan-Gorbachev summit represents a significant event because it proves that U.S. imperialism must take into consideration the world's hopes for peace. Shlyapnikov added: The world's survival is being discussed at Geneva, because there would be no winners or losers in a nuclear war.

Referring to the United States' insistence on including regional conflicts in the agenda for these talks, Ambassador Shlyapnikov said that regional conflicts were created by the United States, itself; likewise, he emphasized, the Soviet Union cannot talk on behalf of other sovereign governments. The Soviet ambassador added: The only thing that we can do is state that we condemn regional conflicts as a potential threat to world peace.

[Begin recording] [Shlyapnikov] We are optimists and we always expect practical and specific results for peace and cooperation between brothers from this meeting. This (?optimism) is based on our country's peaceful policies and the specific proposals we have presented to achieve [word indistinct], to stop the arms buildup and prevent a war, particularly in outer space. All the world is aware of these specific Soviet proposals, so we think that if the U.S. party can also take a step forward, a constructive step forward, assert a willingness to seek an agreement based on a situation that would allow us to achieve a military balance in the world, particularly lowering the levels of confrontation, then we think that we can readily expect positive results from this meeting.

[Unidentified reporter] There is a letter written by U.S. Defense Minister Caspar Weinberger, where he states [corrects himself], suggests to Reagan not to give up "star wars."

[Shlyapnikov] There will always be hawks, particularly in the U.S. Administration. Likewise, there are other forces in the world which are struggling for peace and are demanding — not begging for — peace from U.S. imperialism. These forces may force U.S. imperialism to give in and adopt a much more sensible position in its international relations. The world's survival is at stake;and if no serious steps are taken now toward detente and the normalization of relations between countries with opposing social systems, if no realistic effort is exerted to stop the arms race and prevent it — particularly the nuclear race — in outer space, perhaps this meeting will help achieve positive results. We will then be able to expect some positive results. The mere fact that the two world leaders — of the socialist system and the imperialist system — have met is highly significant. It is significant because U.S. imperialism must take into consideration the hopes of all the people in the world, not because it must respond positively, but due to its obligation to think about it is own survival, too.

When we talk about a military balance, we would like to add that both we and the United States must be interested in attaining a detente because we will all be losers if there is a nuclear holocaust. Consequently, they must take into consideration this reality about our modern world, take some steps toward international detente. Of course, it is difficult to expect extraordinary results, but we could very well embark on the road toward detente and the restriction of weapons. This would be a great contribution, and this event would inspire all the people in the world to struggle even more for international peace and cooperation.

[Reporter] The United States still insists on discussing regional conflicts. What is your opinion about this?

[Shlyapnikov] In our opinion, regional conflicts are the result of the imperialist policy, the aggressive U.S. policy, first of all. Therefore, if they want to talk about these conflicts, they must talk with the government of the countries where they provoked this tension, where they created these areas of tension. Consequently, we cannot talk on behalf of other countries or other governments, although we can give our opinion about the conflictive situation which prevails in some regions of the world, denouncing U.S. imperialism's aggressive policy, because we base our actions on the higher interests of international security. We feel that any area of tension anywhere in the world is a potential threat to international peace. Therefore, we are interested in ending this tense situation in various places of our planet, but we do not want to discuss the [word indistinct] of these people and government with the U.S. Government. That is not our responsibility or our interest.

We are going to denounce the U.S. Government's aggressive policy in different parts of the world and state our solidarity for the peoples who struggle to defend their independence and sovereignty. This has always been our position and we are going to stress the fact that we struggle for peace in all the world. This means that we oppose any regional conflict; we advocate the solution of regional problems based on negotiations, through political means and not by brute force, as it is done by U.S. imperialism in various regions of the world — particularly here in Central America, against the heroic people of Nicaragua. [end recording]

World Figures', Organizations' Hopes for Summit

UN's Perez de Cuellar

LD181944 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 18 TASS — U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar has sent letters to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, noting the great interest of the entire international community in their meeting in Geneva and expressed the universal hope that the goal of peace would be attained in its course.

Forty years ago, as the most destructive war in history was coming to an end, your two countries, allied in that terrible war, looked to the future and joined in an act of great vision. Recognizing the necessity of peace and the special responsibility that the most powerful nations would have in securing it, they united with other countries in founding the United Nations. Without their mutual cooperation, this historic undertaking, on behalf of well-being of all countries and peoples, could scarcely have taken place.

If the Soviet-American negotiations build a basis for enhanced confidence and cooperation between the two countries, an international environment will be encouraged in which greater progress on both global and regional problems can be expected, not least in the United Nations.

The international community expressed the hope that the coming Soviet-American summit meeting will lend the decisive impetus to the negotiations between the two countries so that they should lead to the early attainment of effective accords on termination of nuclear arms race which exerts a negative impact on international security, on reduction of their nuclear arsenals, prevention of the arms race in outer space and peaceful uses of outer space. That hope has been expressed in the resolution on bilateral negotiations concerning nuclear weapons which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of votes at the U.N. General Assembly.

Italy's Andreotti

LD191833 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 19 Nov 85

[Text] Rome, November 19 TASS — The Geneva meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan generates "great expectations" worldwide, Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti has told a correspondent of the Italian radio and television company (RAI-TV).

It is important, he said, that the Geneva summit "resume dialogue". If that happens, the "rest will follow nearly automatically."

"Concrete proposals should be advanced at the summit," Andreotti said, "which, once accepted, would be of great interest."

Arab League Statement

LD200030 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 19 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 20 TASS — An event of exceptional importance in all aspects, this is how the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that started in Geneva has been described by the League of Arab States. A statement of the league's secretary-general Chedli Klibi issued at the United Nations Headquarters expresses the hope that the meeting's results will have a positive impact on all aspects of international relations, will lead, above all, to the lowering of the level of international tension, to the lessening of the threat to universal peace and security, will give a new impetus to the peace movement.

The leadership of the League of Arab States pointed to great interest in the Geneva meeting in Arab countries which hope that it will promote the lessening of the dangerous threat to stability and security in the Middle East resulting from Israel's aggressive policy.

U.S.,Soviet Writers

LD191120 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 19 Nov 85

[Text] Vilnius, November 19 TASS — We are confident that you will use this remarkable opportunity to begin step by step a process which can eventually end the arms race, and bring about the complete elimination of nuclear weapons on earth, a group of Soviet and American writers say in an appeal to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The appeal was adopted by them before a regular "round-table" conference on the role of writers in preserving common human values, which opened in the capital of the Soviet Baltic republic of Lithuania today.

The Geneva talks are inspiring hopes all over the world, the 12 Soviet and 13 American men of letters participating in the conference say. There are among the American participants Norman Cousins, Arthur Miller, Harrison Salisbury, Jerome Lawrence and Robert Lee.

Medical Workers

PM201451 Moscow TRUD in Rusisian 20 Nov 85 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Repin report: "Removing the Nuclear Threat; Joint Appeal by USSR and U.S. Medical Workers"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Nov — In connection with the start of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the American Public Health Association (APHA) and the Central Committee of the USSR Medical Workers Union have sent a joint appeal to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva. It said:

"We representatives of U.S. and USSR health workers' public organizations and participants in the 113th APHA National Conference, being held this year on the topic 'Government Responsibility and the People's Health" have gathered in Washington to discuss the urgent problems concerning the medical public and affecting the interests of the whole of the society which we serve.

"The many years of fruitful cooperation between our organizations — the APHA and the USSR Medical Workers Union — is an example of useful dialogue contributing both to the noble cause of achieving the global aim of 'Health for All' and to the cause of improving mutual standing between our peoples.

"As health workers we are aware that the protection of people's health and very life depends directly on the resolution of the most burning problem of today — the prevention of nuclear war and the preservation of world peace. We believe that the state of Soviet-U.S. relations has a considerable influence on the fate of peace and on the future of all mankind. For this reason we welcome the meeting between our countries' leaders and pin great hopes on it.

"The whole world expects a constructive dialogue between our countries' leaders, dictated by a tremendous responsibility and imbued with the desire to overcome differences and establish mutual understanding.

"A shift is essential toward a radical improvement in the international situation and the achievement of mutually acceptable decisions on such cardinal issues as the preservation of peace and the prevention of nuclear war.

"We particularly appeal to you to achieve an accord in the mutually monitored halting of the development, testing, production, and further stockpiling of nuclear weapons, with a subsequent balanced reduction and total destruction of nuclear arsenals. The resources released as a result of disarmament could be channeled into the struggle against poverty, hunger, and disease and to resolve other urgent social tasks.

"We sincerely believe that your meeting could be a historic milestone on the complex path leading to the goal so greatly desired by all peoples — the banning and complete liquidation of all types of nuclear weapons.

"Those who fulfill their duty to history and do everything possible to rid mankind of the nuclear threat and to achieve the great goal of world peace and health will earn the profound respect of their contemporaries and the gratitude of future generations."

Following the signing of the joint appeal, APHA president Victor (Saydel) and chairman of the USSR Medical Workers Union Central Committee L.I. Novak, who is leading the Soviet delegation invited to the APHA conference, addressed a press conference. They stressed the desire of USSR and U.S. health workers to develop joint action for the sake of the cause of peace and people's health both within the framework of an cooperation agreement between the APHA and the Soviet trade union andby means of joint work in the international organization "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" — which is making a great contribution to the world public's struggle against the nuclear arms race.

Gorbachev Sends Messages en Route to Geneva
LD181818 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 18 Nov 85

["From on Board Plane" — TASS headline]

[Text] [No dateline as received] On his way from Moscow to Geneva the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev sent a telegram to the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic Wojciech Jaruzelski. It says:

"Flying over the territory of the Polish People's Republic I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to you and to the entire fraternal Polish people heartfelt greetings and wishes of success in socialist construction, in our joint efforts to pursue the policy of improving the international situation and strengthening peace in the whole world".

Mikhail Gorbachev sent a telegram to the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Gustav Husak. The telegram says:

"When flying over the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic I convey to you, to the entire people of fraternal Czechoslovakia heartfelt greetings and wishes of new success in building a developed socialist society, in our common struggle to strengthen peace and international security".

Mikhail Gorbachev's telegram to the FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl says:

"Flying over the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany I convey to you my greetings and wishes of wellbeing to the people of the FRG.

"I express hope that relations between the USSR and the FRG will develop in accordance with the Moscow Treaty, in the interests of strengthening European and universal peace".